



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/858,264	05/14/2001	Kai Nyman	NC28444	2668

26933 7590 11/26/2004

ROBERT C. ROLNIK
NOKIA INC.
6000 CONNECTION DRIVE
MD 1-4-755
IRVING, TX 75039

EXAMINER

DAVIS, ZACHARY A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

DATE MAILED: 11/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/858,264

Applicant(s)

NYMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Zachary A Davis

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 January 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 190 (see page 7, line 27), 191 (page 8, line 15), and 239 (page 10, lines 10 and 12).
2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: 231 and 243 (see Figure 2).
3. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The specification appears to contain minor errors. For example, on page 4, line 20, a word appears to be missing from the phrase "the range of a local wireless link up to about 10 meters"; on page 5, line 29, a word appears to be missing in the phrase "Fig. 1 shows a and embodiment in a communication system"; and on page 7, line 28, reference is made to "gateway 190" whereas elsewhere in the specification and in the Figures, the gateway is element 150.

Appropriate correction is required. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Objections

5. Claims 18 and 21-24 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 18 recites the limitation "the a means" in lines 1 and 3 of the claim. It appears this is intended to read "the means". Similarly, Claims 21-24 each recite "the a means" in line 1 of each claim; it appears these are each intended to read "the means".

Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

6. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

7. Claims 1-34 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-34 of copending Application No. 09/867,049 (see US Patent Application Publication 2002/0169966). This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1-24 and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the subscriber identity module" in line 11 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 13 recites the limitation "the subscriber identity module" in line 11 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 15 recites the limitation "the step of transmitting" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 17 recites the limitation "The method according to claim 16"; however, Claim 16 is directed to a client. Further, the claim recites the limitation "the step of using" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 31 recites the limitation "the method" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims not specifically referred to above are rejected due to their dependence on a rejected base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. Claims 1-10, 13-22, and 25-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Turtiainen, US Patent 6430407.

In reference to Claim 1, Turtiainen discloses a method for authenticating a client to a communication system including receiving a subscriber identity from a mobile station (column 9, lines 29-37 and 45-49) where a mobile telecommunication network is separate from the communication system to which the client is being authenticated (column 8, lines 1-7), sending the subscriber identity, receiving a challenge and a secret, and using a response to the challenge and the secret to authenticate the client (column 10, lines 22-39).

In reference to Claims 2, 3, and 8, Turtiainen further discloses receiving a PIN (column 10, lines 26-30) and encrypting the PIN (column 9, line 66-column 10, line 9).

In reference to Claims 4 and 5, Turtiainen further discloses encrypting and transmitting the response (column 10, lines 6-9).

In reference to Claims 6 and 7, Turtiainen further discloses that the transmissions and receptions are performed wirelessly (column 6, lines 18-25).

In reference to Claims 9 and 10, Turtiainen further discloses that the wireless transmissions can use an infrared signal or a radio signal (column 10, lines 51-55).

In reference to Claim 25, Turtiainen discloses a method including retrieving and sending a subscriber identity (column 9, lines 29-37 and 45-49), receiving a challenge, and generating and sending a secret in response to the challenge (column 10, lines 22-39).

In reference to Claims 26, 27, 28, and 29, Turtiainen further discloses receiving a request containing an encrypted PIN and confirming the PIN (column 9, line 66-column 10, line 9; column 10, lines 22-39).

Claims 13-22 and 30-34 are apparatus claims corresponding substantially to the methods of Claims 1-10 and 25-29, respectively, and are rejected by a similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 11-12 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turtiainen in view of Lightman et al, US Patent 6711414.

In reference to Claims 11 and 12, Turtiainen discloses everything as applied to Claim 8 above. Turtiainen also discloses that the wireless transmissions can have any "suitable operational connection" (column 10, lines 53-54); however, Turtiainen does not explicitly disclose the use of a low power radio signal or an acoustic signal for the wireless transmissions.

Lightman discloses a wireless communication apparatus that can transmit wireless signals using an infrared signal, a Bluetooth (low power radio) signal, a radio frequency signal, or an acoustic signal (column 6, lines 36-53).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Turtiainen to use a low power radio signal or acoustic signal for the wireless transmissions, in order to allow the wireless communication devices to easily transmit to and receive from other devices, and to allow the wireless devices to interact with other devices and their surroundings (see Lightman, column 3, lines 19-28).

Claims 23-24 are apparatus claims corresponding substantially to the methods of Claims 11-12, and are rejected by a similar rationale.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Bilgic et al, US Patent 6097817, disclose a communication system including wired and wireless networks and authentication of a user's SIM card.
- b. Waugh, US Patent 6104928, discloses a system for integration of dual networks, including mobile stations with identification in SIMs.
- c. Floden et al, US Patent 6230002, disclose an apparatus for improving authentication security in a wireless host connected to a private network.

- d. Park et al, US Patent 6714799, disclose a system for using a GSM SIM card in a second CDMA network.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zachary A Davis whose telephone number is (571) 272-3870. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 8:30-6:00, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ZAD
zad

Andrew Caldwell
Andrew Caldwell